

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 21, 2009, claims 1 – 14 were rejected. In response, Applicants propose amending claims 1, 2, and 14. Applicants respectfully request that the proposed amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims have been added or canceled.

Objections to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to for being more than 150 words. Furthermore, the abstract was objected to for containing legal phraseology such as “said” and because “(r: quest profile)” at line 17 was not clear. Appropriate corrections have been made and Applicants respectfully request the objection to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biessener et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0088513, hereinafter Biessener). Additionally, claims 6-7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biessener in view of Jameson (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0054864). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Biessener and Jameson for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed limitations and to particularly point out that the request profile includes at least one set of request information elements including information based on requests for access to said memory. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, paragraph [0018]. As amended, claim 1 recites:

“A memory device comprising:
a memory including a plurality of low-latency, rewritable, non-volatile memory cells;
a profile storage unit including access information allocated to at least one request profile, said request profile including at least one set of request information elements including information based on requests for access to said memory;
an access control unit connected with said profile storage unit and said memory, said access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request, said access control unit further configured to determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request.” (emphasis added)

In contrast, Biessener does not disclose that the request profile includes a set of request information elements including information based on requests for access to said memory, as recited in the claim. Biessener merely discloses a partition table 11 that stores a first group of partitions 16A associated with a first user, and a second group 16B associated with a second user. However, the partition entries in the partition table 11 do not include information based on requests for access to said memory. Rather, the partition entries contain data, such as the partition state, which are independent of any access request (a partition state is set, and defines how the controller processes storage access commands, but the partition state itself is not based on the access commands. See Biessener, paragraph 60).

Furthermore, Biessener does not disclose that a control unit is configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request, as recited in the claim. The cited portion of Biessener (paragraphs 69-72) merely discloses that the first four partition entries of partition table 11 define active partitions for the user JONES. Biessener further discloses that upon receiving security information of FDKL33 and a user identifier of JONES, controller 6 presents the first group 16A to the operating system (Biessener, par. 70). However, even if this citation were understood to disclose an access control unit, in general, Biessener nevertheless fails to disclose that the request profile includes a set of request information elements including information based on requests for access to said memory. In fact, Biessener merely discloses presenting each partition to the operating system for each user, but does not disclose that the partition table includes information based on the request for access to the memory.

On page 4, the Office Action states that the partition table information of Biessener indicates access permission for a request, and that Biessener therefore discloses that access rights are determined in dependence on the access information allocated to the access profile. However, the cited portion of Biessener (paragraphs 57-58, table 1) does not disclose a request profile of an access request. Even if this citation were understood to disclose an access profile, in general, Biessener nevertheless fails to teach an access profile of an access request. In fact, Biessener merely discloses that a partition state is stored in a partition table. However, the partition table is not of an access request (Biessener, paragraphs 57-58).

For the reasons presented above, Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1 because Biessener does not disclose a request profile including at least one set of request information elements including information based on requests for access to said memory, as recited in the claim. Furthermore, Biessener does not disclose an access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request, said access control unit further configured to determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Independent Claim 14

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 14 is not anticipated by Biessener at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. In particular, claim 14 recites “request profile including request information elements based on the access request” (emphasis added).

Here, although the language of claim 14 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 14 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 14 is not anticipated by Biessener because Biessener does not disclose request information elements based on the access request, as recited in the claim.

Dependent Claims 2-13

Claims 2-13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2-13 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-13 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 24, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111